

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-26 are pending in the present application. By this response, claims 1, 5, 8, 13, 14, 21 and 26 are amended. Claims 1, 13, 14 and 26 are amended to recite defining confidential information that is to be searched within a history, wherein the history is composed of multiple data elements generated by a browser, searching the history for data elements containing the confidential information, presenting at least one data element that contains the confidential information within the history in the graphical user interface to form a presentation and manipulating the confidential information within the at least one data element responsive to user input. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 13, 14 and 16 may be found at least on page 16, line 15 to page 17, line 4. Claims 5, 8 and 21 is amended to correct minor informalities. Reconsideration of the claims in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Amendments are made to the specification to correct errors and to clarify the specification. No new matter is added by any of the amendments to the specification.

### **I. Examiner Interview**

Applicants thank Examiner Nguyen for the courtesies extended Applicants' representatives during the June 8, 2004 telephone interview. During the interview, Examiner Nguyen provided clarification of the rejections based on the McDonough and Kristol references. Applicants have made amendments to the claims based on the information provided by Examiner Nguyen. Therefore, it is Applicants understanding that, pending an update search by Examiner Nguyen, the present claims are now in condition for allowance. The substance of the interview is summarized in the remarks of Section II, which follows.

## **II. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Alleged Anticipation, Claims 1, 2, 8-10, 13-15, 21-23 and 26**

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 8-10, 13-15, 21-23 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by McDonough et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,878). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As to claims 1, 2 and 9, the Office Action states:

As per **claims 1, 2, and 9** McDonough teaches a method in a data processing system for managing confidential information in a graphical user interface, the method comprising:

Receiving and presenting confidential information within a history generated by a browser in the graphical user interface to form a presentation (col.3, lines 41-48; *user being presented with pages of information after authorized to access*);

receiving a user input (col. 3, lines 44-46) ; and  
manipulating the confidential information using the user input (col.3, lines 41-48;).

Office Action dated March 12, 2004, pages 2-3.

Claim 1, which is representative of the other rejected independent claims 13, 14 and 26 with regard to similarly recited subject matter, reads as follows:

1. (Currently amended) A method in a data processing system for managing confidential information in a graphical user interface, the method comprising:

defining confidential information that is to be searched within a history, wherein the history is composed of multiple data elements generated by a browser;

searching the history for data elements containing the confidential information;

presenting at least one data element that contains the confidential information within the history in the graphical user interface to form a presentation; and

manipulating the confidential information within the at least one data element responsive to user input.

A prior art reference anticipates the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if every element of a claimed invention is identically shown in that single reference, arranged as they are in the claims. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 832, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990). All limitations of the claimed invention must be considered when determining patentability. *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1582, 32 U.S.P.Q.2d 1031, 1034

(Fed. Cir. 1994). Anticipation focuses on whether a claim reads on the product or process a prior art reference discloses, not on what the reference broadly teaches. *Kalman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 713 F.2d 760, 218 U.S.P.Q. 781 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Applicants respectfully submit that McDonough does not identically show each and every feature of the claims arranged as they are in the claims. Specifically, McDonough does not teach defining confidential information that is to be searched within a history, wherein the history is composed of multiple data elements generated by a browser, searching the history for data elements containing the confidential information, presenting at least one data element that contains the confidential information within the history in the graphical user interface to form a presentation, and manipulating the confidential information within the at least one data element responsive to user input.

McDonough is directed to controlling access to information in a distributed computing system. In the McDonough system, a request for the information is received and is accompanied by encrypted session state data. Based on the encrypted session state data, it is determined whether to pass the request on to a source of the information. In a memory buffer, old data is replaced by overwriting with a unique identifier. After the memory buffer has received new data and a procedure has been executed for copying the contents of the memory buffer to a destination, it is determined whether the unique identifier may be found at the destination.

Thus, in the system of McDonough, a gatekeeper determines if the encrypted session state data includes a generic cookie named “PRIVATE” to determine whether the user is allowed access to the information. Applicants respectfully submit that McDonough does not teach defining confidential information that is to be searched within a history, where the history is composed of multiple data elements generated by a browser and searching the history for data elements containing the confidential information, as recited in claim 1. As McDonough is directed to controlling access to information in a distributed computing system and if access is granted displaying the requested information, there would be no need for McDonough to perform these steps.

Additionally, McDonough does not teach presenting at least one data element that contains the confidential information within the history in the graphical user interface to

form a presentation. The Office Action claims that McDonough teaches this feature at column 3, lines 41-48, which reads as follows:

If not, the browser software is provided with a response that presents the user with a login display having blank fields for a social security number or other user ID ("SSN") and a personal identification number ("PIN") (step 1030). After the user fills in the fields, the gatekeeper software receives the SSN and the PIN (step 1040). Based on the SSN and the PIN, it is determined whether the user is authorized to have access to any of the pages of information (step 1050).

In this section, McDonough is merely describing that, if the gatekeeper cannot determine information access based upon the generic cookie "PRIVATE" being present in the information request from the user's browser software at the server, the browser software presents the user with a login display having blank fields for a social security number or other user ID and a personal identification number. Nowhere in this section, or any other section of McDonough, is the user presented with at least one data element that contains confidential information within the history in the graphical user interface.

Furthermore, McDonough does not teach manipulating the confidential information within the at least one data element responsive to user input. The Office Action alleges that this feature is taught by McDonough at column 3, lines 41-48, shown above. As discussed above, McDonough teaches an interface through which the user enters confidential information, rather than presenting at least one data element that contains confidential information to the user. McDonough further teaches that a determination is based on a comparison of the PIN to a PIN of record provided for the SSN by authenticator application software running on an authentication server computer. If the PIN does not match the PIN of record, it is determined that the user is not authorized to have access, and the browser software is provided with a response indicating that access is denied (see column 3, lines 48-57). Still further, McDonough teaches that if the PIN matches the PIN of record, additional authorization details are determined for the user. These authorization details specify, e.g., the realm and the application software types for which the user has authorization. Based on these details, a subcookie is created for each of the following: a ticket (LB\$T) uniquely identifying this session by the user, an authorized realm indicator (LB\$R) defining the realm for which the user has authorization, the user's SSN (LB\$I) for future reference, authorized

application codes (LB\$A) specifying the application software types for which the user has authorization, application-specific data (LB\$D), and an expiration time indicator (SP\$T) for the session (See column 3, line 58 to column 4, line 5). Thus, McDonough only teaches comparison of confidential information that is input by the user to information stored on a server.

McDonough simply is not relevant to the claimed invention beyond merely displaying information. That is, McDonough does not teach defining confidential information that is to be searched within a history, wherein the history is composed of multiple data elements generated by a browser, searching the history for data elements containing the confidential information, presenting at least one data element that contains the confidential information within the history in the graphical user interface to form a presentation, and manipulating the confidential information within the at least one data element responsive to user input. McDonough makes no mention of defining confidential information that is to be searched within a history and searching the history for data elements containing the confidential information. At least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims 1 and 14, the features of dependent claims 2, 8-10, 15 and 21-23 are not taught by McDonough. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 8-10, 13-15, 21-23 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Furthermore, McDonough does not teach, suggest, or give any incentive to make the needed changes to reach the presently claimed invention. Absent the Examiner pointing out some teaching or incentive to implement McDonough such that a user defines confidential information that is to be searched within a history, that is used to search the history for data elements containing the confidential information and presents at least one data element that contains the confidential information within the history in the graphical user interface to form a presentation, and allows the user to manipulate the confidential information within the at least one data element, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be led to modify McDonough to reach the present invention when the reference is examined as a whole. Absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive to modify McDonough in this manner, the presently claimed invention can be reached only

through an improper use of hindsight using the Applicants' disclosure as a template to make the necessary changes to reach the claimed invention.

Moreover, in addition to their dependency from independent claims 1 and 14, the specific features recited in dependent claims 2, 8- 10, 15 and 21-23 are not taught by McDonough. For example, with regard to claims 2 and 15, McDonough does not teach receiving a selection of the confidential information for presentation. The Office Action fails to provide a section of McDonough that teaches this feature. As shown above, while McDonough may present the user with a login display, the login display has blank fields for a social security number or other user ID and a personal identification number. Thus McDonough does not teach receiving a selection of confidential information for presentation as no confidential information is presented.

As an additional example, with regard to claims 9 and 22, McDonough does not teach receiving the selection of information as a user input. The Office Action fails to provide a section of McDonough that teaches this feature. As shown above, while McDonough may present the user with a login display, the login display has blank fields for a social security number or other user ID and a personal identification number. The user does not select the information to be provided as, in the system of McDonough, the user must supply the social security number or other user ID and a personal identification number. Thus McDonough does not teach receiving the selection of information as a user input.

Therefore, in addition to being dependent on independent claims 1 and 14, dependent claims 2, 8- 10, 15 and 21-23 are also distinguishable over McDonough by virtue of the specific features recited in these claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 8-10, 15 and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

### **III. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Alleged Obviousness, Claims 3-4 and 16-17**

The Office Action rejects claims 3-4 and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonough et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,878) in view of Scarborough et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,353,448). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3, 4, 16 and 17 are dependent on claims 1 and 14, and thus, are distinguished over McDonough for at least the reasons noted above with regard to claims 1 and 14. Moreover, Scarborough does not provide for the deficiencies of McDonough and thus, any alleged combination of Scarborough and McDonough would not be sufficient to reject independent claims 1 and 14 or claims 3, 4, 16 and 17 by virtue of their dependency. That is, the combination of McDonough and Scarborough, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the specific features recited in independent claims 1 and 14, from which claims 3, 4, 16 and 17 depend.

Additionally, while Scarborough may teach a presentation that is in a form of a set of thumbnails, wherein each thumbnail represents a Web page, the Web page presented by Scarborough does not contain a portion of the confidential information. As shown above, McDonough presents the user with a login display, the login display has blank fields for a social security number or other user ID and a personal identification number. Thus, neither McDonough nor Scarborough teaches or suggests a presentation that is in a form of a set of thumbnails, wherein each thumbnail represents a Web page containing a portion of the confidential information. Even if McDonough and Scarborough could be properly combined, the combination would not form the present invention recited in claims 3, 4, 16 and 17. Instead, a combination of McDonough and Scarborough would result in a system that provides thumbnails of Web pages that would present the user with a login display, which has blank fields for a social security number or other user ID and a personal identification.

Moreover, the Office Action may not use the claimed invention as an "instruction manual" or "template" to piece together the teachings of the prior art so that the invention is rendered obvious. *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d 1780 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Such reliance is an impermissible use of hindsight with the benefit of Applicant's disclosure. *Id.* Therefore, absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive in the prior art, McDonough and Scarborough cannot be properly combined to form the claimed invention. As a result, absent any teaching, suggestion, or incentive from the prior art to make the proposed combination, the presently claimed invention can be reached only through an impermissible use of hindsight with the benefit of Applicant's disclosure a model for the needed changes.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that McDonough and Scarborough, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of claims 3, 4, 16 and 17. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3, 4, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**IV. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Alleged Obviousness, Claims 5-7 and 18-20**

The Office Action rejects claims 5-7 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonough et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,878) in view of Berstis (U.S. Patent No. 6,243,091). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5-7 and 18-20 are dependent on claims 1 and 14, and thus, are distinguished over McDonough for at least the reasons noted above with regard to claims 1 and 14. Moreover, Berstis does not provide for the deficiencies of McDonough and thus, any alleged combination of Berstis and McDonough would not be sufficient to reject independent claims 1 and 14 or claims 5-7 and 18-20 by virtue of their dependency. That is, the combination of McDonough and Berstis, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the specific features recited in independent claims 1 and 14, from which claims 5-7 and 18-20 depend.

Additionally, while Berstis may teach a presentation in a form of a tree and where information is presented as nodes in the tree, the tree form presentation by Berstis does not contain confidential information. As shown above, McDonough presents the user with a login display, the login display has blank fields for a social security number or other user ID and a personal identification number. Thus, neither McDonough nor Berstis teaches or suggests a presentation is in a form of a tree where confidential information is presented as nodes in the tree.

Even if McDonough and Berstis could be properly combined, the combination would not form the present invention recited in claims 5-7 and 18-20. Instead, a combination of McDonough and Berstis would result in a presentation in the form of a tree that would present the user with a login display, which has blank fields for a social security number or other user ID and a personal identification.

Moreover, the Office Action may not use the claimed invention as an "instruction manual" or "template" to piece together the teachings of the prior art so that the invention is rendered obvious. *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d 1780 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Such reliance is an impermissible use of hindsight with the benefit of Applicant's disclosure. *Id.* Therefore, absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive in the prior art, McDonough and Berstis cannot be properly combined to form the claimed invention. As a result, absent any teaching, suggestion, or incentive from the prior art to make the proposed combination, the presently claimed invention can be reached only through an impermissible use of hindsight with the benefit of Applicant's disclosure a model for the needed changes.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that McDonough and Berstis, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of claims 5-7 and 18-20. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5-7 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**V. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Alleged Obviousness, Claims 11, 12, 24 and 25**

The Office Action rejects claims 11, 12, 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonough et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,878) in view of D. Kristol et al. (Network Working RFC 2109, "HTTP State Management Mechanism", 13 pages, February 1997). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 11, 12, 24 and 25 are dependent on claims 1 and 14, and thus, are distinguished over McDonough for at least the reasons noted above with regard to claims 1 and 14. Moreover, Kristol does not provide for the deficiencies of McDonough and thus, any alleged combination of Kristol and McDonough would not be sufficient to reject independent claims 1 and 14 or claims 11, 12, 24 and 25 by virtue of their dependency. That is, the combination of McDonough and Kristol, taken alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest the specific features recited in independent claims 1 and 14, from which claims 11, 12, 24 and 25 depend.

Additionally, while Kristol may teach a control mechanism to give the user control in deciding which cookies should be saved, Kristol does not teach that the user

input is to delete a selected portion of the confidential information. Moreover, Kristol does not teach the selection of confidential information. As shown above, McDonough presents the user with a login display, the login display has blank fields for a social security number or other user ID and a personal identification number. Thus, neither McDonough nor Kristol teaches or suggests where the user input is to delete a selected portion of the confidential information. Even if McDonough and Kristol could be properly combined, the combination would not form the present invention recited in claims 11, 12, 24 and 25. Instead, a combination of McDonough and Kristol would result in a system that allows a user to save desired cookies and present the user with a login display, which has blank fields for a social security number or other user ID and a personal identification.

Moreover, the Office Action may not use the claimed invention as an "instruction manual" or "template" to piece together the teachings of the prior art so that the invention is rendered obvious. *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d 1780 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Such reliance is an impermissible use of hindsight with the benefit of Applicant's disclosure. *Id.* Therefore, absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive in the prior art, McDonough and Kristol cannot be properly combined to form the claimed invention. As a result, absent any teaching, suggestion, or incentive from the prior art to make the proposed combination, the presently claimed invention can be reached only through an impermissible use of hindsight with the benefit of Applicant's disclosure a model for the needed changes.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that McDonough and Kristol, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of claims 11, 12, 24 and 25. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11, 12, 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**VI. Conclusion**

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the prior art of record and is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: June 14, 2004



Francis Lammes  
Reg. No. 55,353  
Yee & Associates, P.C.  
P.O. Box 802333  
Dallas, TX 75380  
(972) 367-2001  
Agent for Applicants